

B) REMARKS:

1. Introduction

Claims 16-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled by prior amendment. Claim 16 is independent. Claim 16-18 and 20-22 have been amended herein. Certain amendments to the claims have been made in response to the Examiner's rejection in the Office Action, as detailed herein below. Other amendments to the claims have been made to clarify that which Applicants' regard as their invention, and are not meant to limit the scope of such claims or any equivalents thereto. No new subject matter has been entered by these amendments.

2. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In paragraphs 2-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected each of claims 16-22 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,943 to Yu (hereinafter, "Yu"). Applicants believe that this rejection has been overcome by certain amendments to the claims entered herein and for the following reasons.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite:

- a. "assigning a node to a user;"
- b. "storing user data only on the node assigned to the user;"
- c. "determining whether the node can handle an event corresponding to the request based on the values;" and
- d. "copying applications used by the user and the user data from the node assigned to the user to the appropriate node, after which the appropriate node handles the request."

Support for these recitations can be found in the Applicants' Specification, inter alia, at:

- a. paragraph 0106;
- b. paragraph 0015;
- c. paragraphs 0103 to 0106; and
- d. paragraphs 0012-0015.

The recitations above are neither taught nor suggested by Yu, nor by any of the references of record or a combination of the same. Yu teaches that “mapping requests are not issued for each service request. Instead, the result of the mapping request is saved for the TTL period. Subsequent service requests issued during the TTL period will follow the result of the previous mapping and hence be routed to the same server node” (see the third paragraph of the Detailed Description of Yu). Yu also teaches that “[f]or certain services, more than one server may be required, forming a service group (58), to handle the high traffic requirement. These servers may be located at geographically distinct locations. Nevertheless the existence of the multiple servers are transparent to the clients. Clients issue service requests based on a logical or symbolic name of the server group. This can be provided by a domain name server, DNS, to map the logical or symbolic name into the physical or IP address of one of the server nodes in the server group. This is done through a mapping request from the clients to the DNS. The mapping requests are thus different from the service requests, which are issued from the clients to the servers” (see the second paragraph of the Detailed Description of Yu). Yu is also concerned with estimating load usage rather than assigning new nodes based on actual user requests. Thus, according to the system contemplated by Yu, mapping requests, which are separate from service requests, are only initiated to add a new server when a TTL (or time-to-live) period has expired.

Applicants’ amended claims, on the other hand, recite that a request from a user (i.e., a service request, and not a mapping request or a TTL period) is used to determine when to assign a new node to a user. Yu is thus devoid of teaching “determining whether the node can handle an event corresponding to the request based on the values” parsed from a user request as now claimed.

Yu also does not teach or suggest “storing user data only on the node assigned to the user” and “copying applications used by the user and the user data from the node assigned to the user to the appropriate node, after which the appropriate node handles the request.” Although, Yu does teach replication of nodes in a computer network, Yu teaches that all nodes in a group are exact replications of each other. Yu does not teach select copying of particular user data and applications used on one node to another after an appropriate node has been selected to handle a

user request as recited in independent claim 16. The remaining dependent claims incorporate this subject matter due to their ultimate dependency on claim 16.

For at least the reasons above, the amendments to the claims entered herein are believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims based on Yu. Therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection as it pertains to each of the pending claims are respectfully requested.


3. Conclusion

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's comments in the remaining paragraphs of the Office Action. This amendment is responsive to each issue raised in the non-final Office Action dated March 21, 2005. Reconsideration of the claims as amended herein and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

In the event that a further extension of time is required in addition to that requested previously herein, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time, or credit any overpayment, to the below-signed practitioner's deposit account number: 502396.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Charles A. Rattner
Registration No. 40,136
12 Homewood Lane
Darien, CT 06820-6109
(203) 662-9858
(203) 547-6129 (facsimile)
crattner@axiomlegal.net

Dated: September 21, 2005